DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 113 HE 024 013

AUTHOR Townsend, Barbara K.; Wiese, Michael
TITLE Administrative Perceptions of the Value and Content of Higher Education Doctorates. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Portland, OR, November 1-4, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Education; Administrator Qualifications; College Administration; *Curriculum Design; Curriculum Evaluation; *Doctoral Programs; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Postsecondary Education as a Field of Study; *Program Effectiveness; Relevance (Education)
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

A survey of a representative national sample of 1,110 college presidents, vice presidents, deans of academic affairs, and deans of student affairs, of whom 64% responded, investigated attitudes toward the content of higher education degrees and the degree as a credential for prospective administrators in their institutions. Data on respondents' highest degree and its content area were also gathered. Questions about degree content included assessment of: (1) the usefulness of its content to administrators; (2) the necessity of an administrative internship as part of the doctoral program; and (3) the importance of 10 typical courses (budget and finance, college teaching, community and junior colleges, college curriculum, evaluation, history of higher education, law, organization and governance, state and federal policy-making, student development). Respondents were also asked to rank a higher education doctorate in comparison with a doctorate in an academic discipline as the qualifying credential for three administrative positions: student affairs or institutional management; academic affairs administration; and institutional presidency. Results show the programs' training is frequently perceived as useful both by those with higher education doctorates and those with doctorates in academic disciplines. However, a higher education doctorate is not required for most administrative positions and may not be viewed as the best credential for certain positions. Includes 17 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326113

Administrative Perceptions of the Value and Content of Higher Education Doctorates

Barbara K. Townsend
Loyola University of Chicago

Michael Wiese
Anderson University

Paper Presented at Annual Meeting of Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, Oregon, November 1990

HE 024 013

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ASHE

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Red Lion-Jantzen Beach in Portland, Oregon, November 1-4, 1990. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

American higher education as a formal field of study has existed since the late nineteenth century when G. Stanley Hall offered a course in higher education at Clark University in 1893 (Williams 1984). By the 1920s formal programs of study were developed at such institutions as the University of Chicago; Teachers College, Columbia University; the University of Pittsburgh, and Cornell (Ewing & Stickler 1964; Williams 1984). These initial courses and programs were developed primarily to prepare individuals for faculty roles, especially the instructional one, at the institution in which the higher education program was lodged (Burnett 1972; Ewing & Strickler 1964). Over 90 institutions offered higher education courses between 1920 and 1963 (Burnett 1972; Ewing & Stickler 1964).

Only after World War II did higher education doctoral programs began to proliferate. The influx of World War II and Korean War veterans into colleges and universities, a prosperous economy, and the development of an national ethos that saw higher education as a right, not a privilege, provided the impetus for a tremendous expansion of the higher education system, beginning in the 1950s and still continuing, in spite of turndowns in the economy. In 1950 there were 1,851 colleges and universities; by 1970 there were 2,528; in 1990 there are over 3,600 (Clark, 1987; CHE, 1990). With so many colleges and universities being created, there was a need for administrators to develop and maintain the infrastructure of these institutions. This need was particularly acute in the community college, where in the mid 1960s, institutions were being created at the rate of one a week (Cohen and Brawer 1989).

and Brawer 1989). Additionally, already existing institutions were expanding and needed more administrators. In response to this systemic need, higher education programs were created to provide "knowledgeable individuals specifically trained in matters of growth, expansion, and quality" (Dressel and Mayhew 1974, p. 17). In the 1950s there were approximately a dozen programs (Stickler 1974); in the late 1960s there were over 50 institutions offering a higher education concentration at the doctoral level (Rogers 1969); by the mid-1980s there were almost 90 programs leading to a doctorate in higher education (Townsend & Mason 1990). A primary purpose of over 90% of these programs is "the preparation of administrators for colleges and universities (Mason 1990).

That higher education programs have helped meet a systemic need for formally trained administrators seems clear. Many individuals with doctorates in higher education have obtained mid and senior-level administrative positions at a variety of institutional types (Dressel & Mayhew 1974; Moore 1981; Williams 1984; Townsend & Mason 1990). The Leaders in Transition study which examined the careers of almost 3,000 four-year college and university administrators found that of administrators with doctorates, almost 13% held a higher education doctorate (Moore 1981). A study of four-year college chief student affairs officers indicated that of those possessing doctorates, 20% have one in higher education and administration, and 14% have one in college student personnel, a closely related field (Ostroth,

Efird, & Lerman 1984). Of two-year college administrators possessing doctorates, over 41% of presidents, over 39% of chief student affairs officers, and over 34% of chief academic officers have a doctorate in higher education (Moore, Martorana, & Twombly 1985).

While these figures suggest acceptance of the higher education doctorate as appropriate professional training for college and university administrators, there is some concern that the market for recipients of these degrees has been saturated (Crosson & Nelson 1986; Townsend & Mason 1990). It may be that changes in the economy are influencing the hiring of administrators. The downswing in the economy as of the mid 1970s has resulted in limited inter-institutional mobilitity for faculty, at least until recently (See Bowen and Sosa 1990). Consequently, the more traditional pattern of recruiting administrators from the academic disciplines rather than from those with a higher education doctorate may have resurfaced.

It is important for higher education programs to be sensitive to such possible environmental responses to program graduates. In a competitive environment those institutions that survive are those that are able to differentiate themselves in the minds of their constituencies (Baden 1987). Implicit in this view is the need of organizations and programs within them to evaluate continuously the quality and fit of programmatic offerings with environmental needs (Conrad & Wilson 1985). Successful institutions and programs will be those that attend to

environmental responses to them and adjust to changing environmental needs.

Since one form of environmental response to programs is the attitudes of prospective employers toward program graduates, we conducted a study to elicit the attitudes of senior-level administrators toward the content of higher education degrees and toward the degree as a credential for prospective administrators in their institutions. We were seeking to determine if those who play an important role in the hiring of institutional administrators 1) perceive the content of higher education doctoral programs as useful preparation for administrators, and 2) see a value in graduate-level academic preparation for mid and senior-level administrators.

Methodology and Data Sources

The population for the study was all presidents, vice-presidents/deans of academic affairs, and vice-presidents/deans of student affairs in the approximately 2,700 non-profit colleges and universities listed in the Carnegie Foundation's A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (1987). (Note: Specialized institutions were excluded). A stratified random sample of these individuals was selected by first selecting the institutions and then identifying their administrators. To select the institutions, we computed the percentage of each institutional type in the population with the following results: research universities (4%), doctoral granting (4%), comprehensive

colleges and universities (21%), liberal arts colleges (21%), and community colleges and techical institutes (50%). We then randomly selected institutions within each type according to the following percentages (chosen in order to ensure an adequate number of institutions in the sample): 10% each for research and doctoral granting (37 institutions each), 20% each for comprehensive and liberal arts colleges (74 institutions each), and 40% community colleges (148 institutions). The name and address of each institututution's president, vice-president/dean of academic affairs, and vice-president/dean of student affairs were obtained from the 1989 Peterson's Higher Education Directory. In this way 1110 individuals were identified as the sample.

We sent a researcher-designed survey, developed with input from colleagues in higher education programs and pilot tested with a sample of senior-level college and university administrators, to the institutional address of each individual in the sample. The two-page questionnaire was designed to elicit perpections regarding the curriculum of higher education doctoral programs and the value of the degree as a qualifying credential for various administrative positions. Additionally certain demographic variables were requested: highest degree held, and content area of degree.

Results

In addition to the calculation of descriptive statistics, chi-square tests were conducted to determine relationships among

responses, institutional type, administrative position, and degree held by respondents.

The overall response rate was 64%, including 61% of the presidents, 65% of the vice-presidents/deans of academic affairs, and 61% of the vice-presidents/deans of student affairs. The breakdown of respondents according to institutional type was as follows: 62% from research universities, 58% from doctoral granting institutions, 66% from comprehensive colleges and universities, 62% from liberal arts colleges, and 68% from community colleges. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents had a doctorate in higher education: 36% of the vice-presidents/deans of student affairs, 32% of the presidents, 17% of the vice-presidents/deans of academic affairs. Those holding the doctorate in higher education were also most likely to be in the community college sector and least likely to be at research and doctoral granting institutions.

Perceptions of Content of Higher Education Doctorate

Questions about the content of the higher education degree included an assessment of 1) the usefulness of its content to administrators, 2) the necessity of an administrative internship as part of the doctoral program, and 3) the importance of ten typical higher education courses (budget and finance in higher education, college teaching, community and junior colleges, curriculum of higher education, evaluation in higher education, history of higher education, law in higher education,

organization and governance in higher education, state and federal policy-making in higher education, student development in higher education).

When asked to assess the usefulness of the content of the higher education doctorate (See Table 1), 35% of the respondents had a positive response, indicating the content was "useful for providing both theory and practical applications of theory for would-be and current administrators." Thirty-one percent had more negative perceptions with 22% viewing the content as "too theory-based: lacking in knowledge of 'real-world' administrative problems," and nine percent seeing it as "too practitioner-oriented: lacking in the conceptual base characteristic of most academic disciplines." Thirty-four percent were "unable to answer" because of "too little knowledge of the degree."

Responses varied by institutional type and position. Thirty-two percent of senior-level administrators of research and doctoral granting universities regarded the content as "useful" as compared to 27% of administrators at comprehensive colleges and universities, 28% of administrators at liberal arts colleges, and 42% of community college administrators. Administrators in research and doctoral granting universities were most apt to regard the content as "too practitioner-oriented" or to lack knowledge of the degree. Regardless of institutional type, vice-presidents/deans of student affairs were the administrators most apt to regard the content positively: forty-five percent of these individuals perceived the content as useful as compared to 37% of

presidents and 25% of vice-presidents/deans of academic affairs.

We found several statistical relationships between responses and respondents' demographics. First of all, there was a statistical relationship between the respondent's position and assessment of the content. The relationship (X^2=29.119, d.f.=6, p=.000) indicated that student affairs deans were most likely to see the degree as useful for administrators, while academic vice-presidents/deans were least likely. This relationship between position and perception holds true even when the analysis excludes respondents from the community college sector (X^2=45.790, d.f.=6, p=.000). A relationship also exists between content area of respondent's doctorate (higher education or other) and respondent's assessment of the content of the degree (X^2=118.470, d.f.=3, p=.0000). Those who have a degree in higher education were most likely to say that the degree's content is useful preparation for administrators. Sixty-seven percent of respondents with a doctorate in higher education perceived the degree as useful for providing both theory and practical applications for administrators as compared to 23% of respondents without a higher education doctorate.

When questioned about the value of internships in higher education doctoral programs, respondents were almost unanimous that semester-long internships in an administrative position while pursuing the degree would be beneficial for higher education students. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents perceived this internship as "very necessary: should be

required," while 38% saw it as "somewhat necessary: should be optional." Opinions about internships were statistically the same for all three administrative positions held by respondenst regardless of institutional type (X^2=6.503, d.f.=4, p=.1646) and were not related to the type of degree held by respondents (X^2=14.847, d.f.=12, p=.2499).

When asked to choose among ten typical higher education courses as to which were the "most important for students learning about higher education administration," respondents, regardless of institutional type, were most apt to choose "Budgeting and Finance in Higher Education" (48%) followed by "Organization and Governance in Higher Education (40%). Other courses which were selected by over half the respondents were "Curriculum in Higher Education," "Evaluation in Higher Education," "Law in Higher Education," and "Student Development in Higher Education."

Assessment of Degree as Qualifying Credential for Administrative Positions

Respondents were also asked to rank a higher education doctorate in comparison to a doctorate in an academic discipline as the qualifying credential for three kinds of administrative positions: 1) student affairs or institutional management positions such as Dean of Student Affairs or Business Affair or Director of Institutional Research, 2) academic affairs administrative positions such as Assistant/Associate Dean of

Instruction, Dean of Instruction, Division or Department Chair, and 3) College/University President.

Student affairs or institutional management positions. When asked to compare a higher education doctorate to a doctorate in an academic discipline as a qualifying credential for student affairs or institutional management positions (See Table 2), almost half (47%) the respondents indicated a preference for a higher education doctorate: seventeen percent saw it as "definitely preferable and 30% as "somewhat more preferable." Responses varied by institutional type, with community college administrators the most likely to prefer the higher education doctorate (54%) and adminstrators at doctoral-granting universities the least likely (33%).

We found several statistical relationships between responses and respondents' demographics. There was a relationship between administrative position held and preference for the higher education doctorate as a qualifying credential. Student affairs vice-presidents/deans were the most likely to prefer the higher education doctorate as a qualifying credential for student affairs or institutional management positions (X^2=49.693, d.f.=8, p=.0000), with 60% considering the degree as either "somewhat preferable" or "definately preferable." Presidents appeared to be neutral concerning the degree, while academic deans were least likely to prefer the higher education doctorate (X^2=49.68, d.f.=.8, p=.000). There was also a relationship between respondents' content area of doctorate and attittude toward the

the higher education doctorate as a qualifying credential. Regardless of administrative position, respondents with a doctorate in higher education were more apt to prefer a higher education doctorate (X^2=70.51, d.f.=4, p=.000).

There was also a three-way relationship among a respondents' perception of the degree's content, attitude toward the degree as a credential for student affairs or institutional management positions, and content area of doctorate. Respondents without a doctorate in higher education were more likely to indicate a preference for the degree as a credential when the respondents perceive the content of the higher education degree to be "useful" or "too theory-based" (X^2=53.571, d.f.=12, p=.000). A total of 87% of this group of respondents indicated the higher education doctorate would be "at least equal" (32%), "slightly preferable" (29%), or "definitely preferable" (26%) to a degree in an academic discipline. Of the respondents holding a doctorate in higher education and perceiving the degree's content as useful, a total of 98% indicated support of the higher education doctorate as a qualifying credential: 33% equal in preference, 32% somewhat preferable, and 33% definitely preferable.

Academic affairs administrative positions. When evaluating candidates for academic affairs positions such as Associate Dean or Dean of Instruction, respondents preferred them to have a doctorate in an academic discipline (See Table 3). Only 16% saw the doctorate in higher education as either "definitely

preferable" (5%) or "somewhat preferable" (11%), while 62% indicated it was less preferable. In no institutional sector was the doctorate in higher education preferred for these positions. Twenty-three percent of the respondents viewed the higher education doctorate as "equal to a degree in an academic discipline" as a qualifying credential, with community college administrators being the most inclined to view the degree as equal (38%).

Unlike responses about student affairs or institutional management positions, respondents with a doctorate in higher education did not prefer it as a qualifying credential for academic affairs administrators, except in the community college sector. Respondents without a higher education doctorate were more likely to prefer the degree when they perceived its content as "useful" or "too theory-based" (X^2=39.269, d.f.=12, p=.001). Of this subgroup of respondents, a total of 45% indicated a higher education degree would be "equal," (21%), "somewhat preferable" (19%), or "definitely preferable" (6%). Respondents with a higher education doctorate and with the perception that the degree's content is useful were more inclined to see the degree as "equal" (41%), but otherwise seemed to share the attitudes of those without a higher education doctorate: Sixteen percent indicated the degree was "somewhat preferable" and 7% said it was "definitely preferable."

College presidencies. When evaluating a higher education doctorate as preparation for a college or university presidency

(See Table 4), 27% of the respondents regarded it as preferable, while 41% indicated it was less preferable than a degree in an academic discipline. Responses varied widely by institutional sector with respondents in research and doctoral granting universities least apt to prefer the higher education doctorate and respondents in the community college most apt to prefer it. Seventeen percent of community college administrators would prefer a presidential applicant with a doctorate in an academic discipline as compared to 77% of administrators in the research university. Excluding responses from the community college sector, only 12% would prefer an applicant with a doctorate in higher education.

As with preferences for qualifying credentials for academic affairs administrators, respondents with a higher education doctorate were not more likely to prefer applicants with a higher education doctorate, except in the community college sector. Again, respondents without a higher education doctorate were more likely to indicate a preference for the degree when they perceive its content as "useful" or "too theory-based" (X^2=47.336, d.f.=12, p=.000). Sixty-five percent of this subgroup indicated the degree would be "equal" (36%), "somewhat preferable" (15%), or "definitely preferable" (14%). A total of 88% of respondents holding a higher education degree and perceiving the degree's content to be useful indicated the degree was "equal" (42%), "somewhat preferable" (25%), or "definitely preferable" (21%).

Discussion

Judging from the results of this study, the reviews are mixed concerning the content of higher education doctoral programs. Of the approximately two-thirds of the respondents who considered themselves knowledgeable enough about the degree to evaluate its content, almost half did not regard its content as "useful . . . for would-be and current administrators." Given popular conceptions of education as a field lacking in theory, it is interesting that those who do not regard the content as useful are more inclined to perceive it as too theoretical rather than as lacking in a conceptual base. The most positive response to the higher education doctoral degree is in the community college sector, where the degree's content is most likely to be perceived as useful and least likely to be perceived as "too theory-based" or "too practitioner-oriented." It is in the research and doctoral granting universities that the degree's content is least known and least valued as useful.

Suggestions for improving the content are implied by responses regarding internships and courses. Internships, whether required or optional, are viewed as an important part of higher education programs by those who would hire their graduates. In their examination of higher education programs, Crosson and Nelson (1986) found that 40% of the Ph.D. and 51% of the Ed.D. programs require a practicum or internship. How many programs provide an internship as an option is not known. Programs which do not provide at least the option of an

internship should consider doing so. Similarly a course in higher education budgeting and finance and one in organization and governance are seen by senior-level administrators as the most important courses "for students learning about higher education administration." While there is no study detailing the curricular offerings of all the currently existing higher education programs, our sense is that most, if not all, higher education programs require a course in organization and governance. However, a course in budget and finance is more likely to be an option and may not even be offered. The findings of this study suggest that every higher education program whose primary purpose is training administrators should offer this course.

Perceptions regarding the value of academic preparation for administrative positions are implied in responses concerning the value of a higher education doctorate as a qualifying credential for various administrative positions. It appears that senior-level administrators are most inclined to regard academic preparation in administration as appropriate for student affairs or institutional management positions. Regardless of institutional type, the majority of senior-level administrators indicated they would view the higher education doctorate as either preferable to or equal to a degree in an academic discipline, when examining the applications of candidates for these positions. Similarly, while the percentage was lower, the majority of respondents seemed to view academic preparation in

administration as appropriate for college presidents. The attitude toward the value of formal preparation for academic affairs positions is quite different. Here the majority of respondents viewed a doctorate in higher education as less preferable than a doctorate in an academic discipline.

An unintended finding in this study was the response of higher education program graduates toward the degree. In general their response was favorable, with the majority of those holding a higher education doctorate perceiving the degree's content as "useful... for would-be and current administrators." Respondents with a higher education doctorate were also more apt than those without a higher education doctorate to view it as a preferred qualifying credential for student affairs and institutional management positions. When looking at candidates for college presidencies, almost half the respondents with higher education degrees were neutral toward a higher education degree as the preferred credential. However, except in the community college sector, even respondents with a higher education doctorate were not inclined to prefer it to a doctorate in an academic discipline when evaluating applicants for academic affairs positions.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Higher education doctoral programs have primarily been established to provide formal training for mid and senior-level college and university administrators and have been a source of

administrators who have been formally trained in college and university administration. As this study indicates, this training is frequently perceived of as useful, both by individuals who possess the higher education doctorate and by those who possess a doctorate in an academic discipline. However, a higher education doctorate is not usually required for most administrative positions. In fact, as this study indicates, a higher education doctorate may not be viewed as the best credential for certain administrative positions such as college presidencies or those in academic affairs.

Why the higher education doctorate is not usually the preferred credential for presidencies or academic affairs administrative positions is unclear. This attitude toward the higher education doctorate may reflect the traditional perspective that the college president is simply a faculty member who has become first among peers. As a former faculty member, the president would, of course, have a disciplinary background rather than the formal administrative training represented by a higher education doctorate. Since until recently the inter-institutional mobility of many faculty members was limited, the preference for doctorates in academic disciplines as the credential for presidents and academic affairs administrators could be maintained. This preference may also reflect the adage, "Those who can, do; those who can't, teach; and those who can't teach, administer." Just as many assume college professors only need to learn their discipline to be able to teach it, so too do

many assume adminstrators do not need any formal training to administer entire institutions, if they are college presidents, or to administer academic affairs, if they are deans or associate deans or department chairs. Similarly administrators with doctorates in academic disciplines may see the value of formal training in administration but still do not insist on it for administrators. Perhaps their failure to do so reflects their reluctance to admit that they may have been inadequately prepared for their administrative responsibilities since this admission might cast doubt on their current abilities as administrators.

Until there is some evidence that graduates of higher education doctoral program are more effective administrators than those who do not possess this degree, it will be difficult to argue for preferring a higher education doctorate as a qualifying credential for most administrative positions. In the meantime higher education faculty can be heartened by the positive response of recipients of the degree even though these recipients do not always believe that the degree is the preferred academic credential for certain administrative positions. Certainly the value of the knowledge base provided by higher education programs seems to be substantiated by this study. Senior-level administrators' need for information on higher education budgeting and finance, organization and governance, law, evaluation, facilities management, and student affairs is indicated in preferences for essential courses as well as by voluntary written responses. Individual higher education

programs need to use the curricular feedback provided by this study so that higher education programs in general can continue to fit their programmatic offerings with changing environmental needs and thus not only survive but prosper.

REFERENCES

Baden, C. (1987). Competitive strategies for continuing education. In C. Baden (ed.) Competitive Strategies for for Continuing Education. New Directions for Continuing Education No. 35. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass._

Bowen, W. G., & Sosa, J. A. (1990). Prospects for faculty in arts and sciences: A study of factors affecting demand and supply 1987 to 2012. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Burnett, C. W. (1972). Higher education as a specialized field of study: A review and interpretation of the literature. In Higher Education as a Field of Study. Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting. Chicago: Association of Professors of Higher Education.

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1989). The American community college (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conrad, C. F., & Wilson, R. F. (1985). Academic program reviews: Institutional appraoches, expectations, and controversies. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

Crosson, P. H. , & Nelson, G. M. (1986). A profile of higher education doctoral programs. Review of Higher Education 9: 335-357.

Dressel, P. L., & Mayhew, L. B. (1974). Higher education as a field of study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ewing, J. C., & Stickler, W. H. (1964). Progress in the development of higher education as a field of professional graduate

study and research. Journal of Teacher Education 15: 397-403.

Mason, S. 1990. Career paths of graduates of higher education programs. Unpublished paper.

Moore, K. M. Leaders in transition: A national study of higher education administrators. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Moore, K. M., Martorana, S.V., & Twombly, S. (1985). Today's academic leaders: A national study of administrators in community and junior colleges. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Ostroth, D.D., Efird, F. D., & Lerman, L. S. (1984). Career patterns of chief student affairs officers. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 443-447.

Rogers. J. F. (1969). Higher education as a field of study at the doctoral level. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, National Education Association.

Stickler, W. H. (1974). The association of professors of higher education: Past, present, and future. In J. L. Miller, Jr. (ed.), Scholarship and Teaching in the Field of Higher Education. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Service.

The nation. (1990, September 5). Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, p. 3.

Townsend, B. K., & Mason, S. O. (1990). Career paths of graduates of higher education programs. The Review of Higher Education.

Williams, D. (1984). Whither the study of higher education. The Review of Higher Education, 7, 175-178.

TABLE 1

Assessment of Degree Content by
Type and Title (n/total %)

Type: 1 = Research, 2 = Doctoral Granting, 3 = Comprehensive
4 = Liberal Arts, 5 = Community College
Title: 1 = President, 2 = Academic Dean, 3 = Dean of Student Affairs

Type

	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Too Theory Based	6/ .9	11/1.6	36/ 5.3	24/ 3.4	76/11.0	153/ 22.1
Too Practitioner Oriented	10/1.4	10/1.4	17/ 2.5	10/ 1.4	13/ 1.9	60/ 8.6
Useful for Theory & Practice	26/3.7	20/2.9	37/ 5.4	37/ 5.4	125/18.0	245/ 35.4
Too Little Knowledge	26/3.7	26/3.7	49/ 7.0	59/ 8.5	77/11.0	237/ 33.9
TOTAL	68/9.7	67/9.6	139/20.0	130/18.7	291/41.8	695/100.0

Type: (n = 695, x^2 = 41.66, d.f. = 12, p = .000)

Title

	1	2	3	TOTAL
Too Theory Based	51/ 7.4	53/ 7.6	49/ 7.1	153/ 22.1
Too Practitioner Oriented	23/ 3.3	29/ 4.2	8/ 1.1	60/ 8.6
Useful for Theory & Practice	82/11.8	59/ 8.7	104/14.9	245/ 35.4
Too Little Knowledge	65/ 9.3	101/14.4	71/10.2	237/ 33.9
TOTAL	221/31.8	242/34.9	232/33.3	695/100.0

Title: (n = 695, x^2 = 29.12, d.f. = 6, p = .0001)

TABLE 2

Assessment of Degree as Qualifying Degree
for Position of Student Affairs Dean
(Compared to degree in an academic discipline)

Type: 1 = Research, 2 = Doctoral Granting, 3 = Comprehensive
4 = Liberal Arts, 5 = Community College
Title: 1 = President, 2 = Academic Dean, 3 = Dean of Student Affairs

Type

	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Definitely Less Preferable	9/1.2	6/ .9	16/ 2.3	16/ 2.3	20/ 2.9	67/ 9.7
Somewhat Less Preferable	12/1.7	14/2.0	23/ 3.2	23/ 3.2	22/ 3.1	94/ 13.2
Equal to	24/3.4	23/3.2	38/ 5.4	34/ 4.9	90/12.8	209/ 29.7
Somewhat More Preferable	14/2.0	15/2.2	48/ 6.9	41/ 5.8	92/13.2	210/ 30.1
Definitely More Preferable	9/1.2	6/ .9	18/ 2.6	18/ 2.6	69/ 9.8	120/ 17.1
TOTAL	68/9.5	64/9.2	143/20.4	132/18.8	293/41.8	700/100.0

Type: ($n = 700$, $x^2 = 34.18$, d.f. = 16, $p = .0052$)

Title

	1	2	3	TOTAL
Definitely Less Preferable	27/ 3.8	28/ 4.2	12/ 1.7	67/ 9.7
Somewhat Less Preferable	37/ 5.4	33/ 4.9	20/ 2.9	94/ 13.2
Equal to	64/ 9.1	87/12.6	56/ 8.0	209/ 29.7
Somewhat More Preferable	61/ 8.8	75/10.8	74/10.6	210/ 30.1
Definitely More Preferable	34/ 4.9	18/ 2.6	68/ 9.7	120/ 17.1
TOTAL	225/32.0	245/35.1	230/32.9	700/100.0

Title: ($n = 700$, $x^2 = 49.69$, d.f. = 8, $p = .0000$)

TABLE 3

Assessment of Degree as Qualifying Degree
for Position of Academic Affairs Dean
(Compared to degree in an academic discipline)
by Type and Title

Type: 1 = Research, 2 = Doctoral Granting, 3 = Comprehensive
4 = Liberal Arts, 5 = Community College
Title: 1 = President, 2 = Academic Dean, 3 = Dean of Student Affairs

Type

	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Definitely Less Preferable	47/6.8	40/5.8	72/10.4.3	70/ 9.7	45/ 6.5	274/ 39.2
Somewhat Less Preferable	14/2.2	13/1.8	37/ 5.4	28/ 4.0	69/ 9.8	161/ 23.2
Equal To	4/.6	13/1.7	23/ 3.1	23/ 3.1	102/12.8	165/ 22.1
Somewhat More Preferable	2/.3	2/ .3	8/ 1.2	10/ 1.4	43/ 6.3	65/ 10.5
Definitely more preferable	1/ .2	0/ .0	1/ .2	4/ .6	29/ 4.1	35/ 5.0
TOTAL	68/9.5	64/9.2	143/20.4	132/18.8	293/41.8	700/100.0

Type: (n = 700, x^2 = 34.18, d.f. = 16, p = .0052)

Title

	1	2	3	TOTAL
Definitely Less Preferable	97/13.8	119/17.0	58/ 8.3	274/ 39.2
Somewhat Less Preferable	42/6.0	56/ 8.0	63/ 9.1	161/ 23.2
Equal To	49/6.9	41/ 5.7	75/10.4	165/ 22.1
Somewhat More Preferable	24/3.5	19/ 2.8	22/ 3.2	65/ 10.5
Definitely More Preferable	10/1.4	1100 1.4	115/ 2.2	35/ 5.0
TOTAL	225/32.0	245/35.1	230/32.9	700/100.0

Title: (n = 700, x^2 = 49.69, d.f. = 8, p = .0000)

TABLE 4

Assessment of Degree as Qualifying Degree
for Position of President (n/total %)
(Compared to degree in an academic discipline)
by Type and Title

Type: 1 = Research, 2 = Doctoral Granting, 3 = Comprehensive
4 = Liberal Arts, 5 = Community College
Title: 1 = President, 2 = Academic Dean, 3 = Dean of Student Affairs

Type

	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Definitely Less Preferable	33/4.7	29/4.1	37/ 5.2	39/ 5.5	25/ 3.5	163/ 23.0
Somewhat Less Preferable	18/2.6	16/2.3	39/ 5.6	26/ 3.7	27/ 3.8	126/ 18.0
Equal To	13/1.8	18/2.7	47/ 6.7	42/ 5.9	105/14.9	225/ 32.0
Somewhat More Preferable	2/ .3	2/ .3	14/ 2.1	15/ 2.1	66/ 9.3	99/ 14.1
Definitely More Preferable	2/ .2	3/ .3	6/ .6	11/ 1.5	71/10.1	93/ 12.7
TOTAL	68/9.6	68/9.6	143/20.2	133/18.7	294/41.6	706/100.0

Type: (n = 706, x^2 = 161.43, d.f. = 16, p = .0000)

Title

	1	2	3	TOTAL
Definitely Less Preferable	62/ 8.8	74/10.4	27/ 3.8	163/ 23.0
Somewhat Less Preferable	34/ 5.0	52/ 7.3	40/ 5.6	126/ 18.0
Equal To	63/ 9.1	70/ 9.9	92/13.1	225/ 32.0
Somewhat More Preferable	36/ 4.9	27/ 3.8	40/ 5.5	99/ 14.1
Definitely More Preferable	32/ 4.3	25/ 3.4	36/ 5.0	93/ 12.7
TOTAL	226/32.1	246/34.8	234/33.0	706/100.0

Title: (n = 706, x^2 = 31.95, d.f. = 8, p = .0001)